

our law enforcement officials in our communities together, as will my Republican colleagues who voted in favor, as we move to conference committee to merge the Senate and House proposals into one bill that works for everybody and protects our police officers.

I will insist that the final package be written in a way that both protects citizens' constitutional and civil rights and preserves the noble profession of law enforcement—the profession that I have dedicated the majority of my adult life to, the profession that my great-uncle Phil sacrificed his life and paid the ultimate price for having been killed in the line of duty as an NYPD police officer.

Madam Speaker, this moment calls on all of us to come together and repair this social contract so that we as Americans can start to heal. I firmly believe that we are all capable of rising to this challenge because my own community in Bucks and Montgomery Counties in Pennsylvania has been a model when it comes to police-community relations.

We need to apply the community model of my amazing colleagues back home in law enforcement, always making improvements based on self-reflection, listening, understanding, and learning, and show the rest of our Nation and the world that we are a country of law and order, a country that respects the rights, dignity, and equality of every single individual, and a country where police officers are one with the communities in which they serve, which is certainly the case back home.

I am so proud of our law enforcement officers. We have a chance at real positive change, Madam Speaker. Let us not miss this moment. We can support our law enforcement officers and enact meaningful reform. I, for one, will be insisting on both before any final bill goes to the President's desk.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AND STILL I RISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. And I rise tonight to express my support for H.R. 2, the Moving Forward Act.

I have supported this legislation because it is not only good for my congressional district, it is also good for the country.

This legislation will allow us to do something that I think is quite important. I sit on the Financial Services Committee, and it allows us to address housing as a part of our Nation's infrastructure. The Honorable MAXINE WATERS has worked tirelessly to get housing included in this legislation. I believe it will benefit many people, especially those people who may find themselves with rent due and an inability to pay their bills.

I also am proud to say that it will help our ports. We have the Port of Houston, and that is a port that is very significant as it relates not only to Houston but to the country.

It will help with our schools, and it will help with broadband. It is a very good piece of legislation.

But there is one additional thing in this legislation that I think would be of benefit, not only to the young people in this country but also to our police officers. This is H. Res. 169 which is a piece of legislation that emanated in my office. This would have a driver and an officer safety education component.

We talk about the conversations that African American parents have with their children. This is a conversation that takes place because of a history that we too well understand. This legislation addresses that conversation, but it addresses it not only as it relates to the young person, the person who is going to be driving the car, it also addresses it as it relates to the officer.

It would grant States moneys for grants such that they would be able to train officers about the interactions with civilians and train civilians, give them the education that they need so that they will understand how to properly interact with officers.

Understanding can change the course of history. It can make a difference in the lives of people. My hope is that with this legislation in H.R. 2 it will cause somebody to benefit from just knowing how to interact with a person who happens to be a police officer or a police officer getting a better understanding of how to interact with someone from a given community.

As important as this piece of legislation is, I do understand that if we are to have the kind of change that we seek, we will probably have to have another piece of legislation that I am proud to offer. This is a piece of legislation calling for a department of reconciliation. A lot of what is happening in our country is systemic. It is institutionalized. If we want to deal with systemic and institutionalized problems, especially as they relate to race, then we need to have a department so that we can approach these systemic issues not only in the short term but over the years and over the decades.

This department of reconciliation will, of course, have a secretary of reconciliation. This secretary will have the responsibility of devising the strategy and implementing a strategy to eliminate racism and invidious discrimination in our country.

□ 1845

This department will be properly funded. We would like to see it funded with a minimum of 10 percent of what the Department of Justice receives. This would be the equivalent—the money would not come from the Department of Justice—but the equivalent of 10 percent of what the Department of Justice receives as a minimum in funding.

This department would be one that would give us the opportunity to look into the future and devise a means by which we can avoid some of the systemic problems that we currently have.

Madam Speaker, my hope is that this resolution will get the support of my colleagues. It has gained support every day, and I look forward to getting the continued support of my colleagues for the resolution. The resolution, of course, is the forerunner to a bill, a bill that will actually develop this department of reconciliation.

We found that there is a Labor Department, and this Labor Department, of course, deals with issues associated with labor. We have other departments that are specialties. They specialize in dealing with certain issues. Well, why not a department of reconciliation so that we can do something that has long been needed since the Emancipation Proclamation?

While we had the invidious discrimination known as segregation, through the years, we have not done what we need to do, and that is reconcile, settle our differences, come to a conclusion as to what is appropriate when it comes to some of the icons that we have in this country with reference to Civil War memorabilia and where it can be placed. These kinds of things can be resolved through the department of reconciliation.

Madam Speaker, my hope is that we will have the department available to us in the near future. My hope is that this is something that Presidential candidates will embrace and want to talk about. I will surely put it before candidates when given the opportunity because the secretary will report directly to the President of the United States. This will give us the insight that we need into the Office of the Presidency. And the President can, of course, provide legislation by and through the secretary.

It is a good piece of legislation, and my hope is that we will get it passed.

Finally, this: I am honored to say that I, too, support law enforcement. My uncle was a deputy sheriff. He had a great amount of influence on my life. I believe that I am in Congress today because of some things that he said and urged me to do.

Madam Speaker, I support law enforcement. I don't paint all law enforcement officers with the same brush, just as I don't want all protesters to be painted with the same brush.

I support the right to peacefully protest. I believe that if we who support the protest movements and support peace officers, if we would actually let people know that there are some persons who are in the police forces that are not acceptable because of their behavior, and there are some people who are associating themselves with the protest movement who are not acceptable because of their behavior—persons who do things that are inappropriate, persons who would burn buildings, this

is inappropriate. I don't support that. Officers who would put their knees on the necks of persons, that is inappropriate. No one would support that, I would hope.

Madam Speaker, I just think that, as we move forward, let's not conclude that there is something wrong with the protest movement because of some of the people who associate themselves with the movement, just as I don't conclude that there is something wrong with all police officers because of the actions and behavior of some police officers. There are people within both of these entities that I speak of who are good, and the bad ones, we, of course, should eliminate.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, Judge AL GREEN. He is a brother, and I appreciate him very much. We have differences of opinion, but I know we are going to end up the same place together.

Madam Speaker, there is so much that has been going on that has been disrupting the country, and I am not sure what all my good friend, a former judge in Houston, was saying. I didn't get to hear that. But I believe he was addressing some of the unrest.

He and I both want to see freedom. We want to see equality. We want to see people treated fairly and equally. Those are things we share, and I know that is what is on his heart.

But I am highly concerned about the legitimate peaceful protests that were taking place as a result of the cruel death, the killing of George Floyd. And his family, and the way they approached it, was inspirational. There deserve to be protests over that horrendous death.

The Floyd family pointed out they did not want the legacy of George Floyd to be violence and suffering and death and looting. That was not, and is not, what they want for the memory and legacy of George Floyd.

But the movement has been hijacked. The violence they don't want, just the justice they want. It has been hijacked. And it is very important that Americans understand what is going on here, so that it is not just those who have spent our lifetimes studying history that see so clearly what is going on by instigators who want to see the country that has been in an ongoing state of getting better and better—for years, even with unfairness and inequality, it has still been the hope of the world when it comes to freedom and a shot at equality.

Antifa, short for antifascist—and there has been no greater irony in the

world that Hitler and Stalin—two mad men, evil men with a globalist desire—ended up against each other. Of course, it is quite ironic that when they got together and signed a treaty, both of them, behind the scenes, were talking about the day when that individual would breach the treaty with the other.

One of the things Stalin was so furious about when Hitler moved east was that Hitler broke the treaty before Stalin had the chance to. They were two evil people, and they were pushing an evil idea: with Hitler, the evil of fascism; with Stalin, the evil of Marxism, communism, socialism, whatever you want to call it. It is all about the same thing.

So, you have communism and fascism. Both of them want globalism. They want to control the world, and they don't want anybody else to control it. They want to control it.

The treachery and the evil that went under both of those leaders is legendary. Hitler killed over 6 million Jews in some of the most horrific and evil ways conceivable. Stalin did the same thing, except he killed many millions more.

Then in China, decades after that came Mao, who brought communism to China. It is hard to get your arms around a proper number. We know Stalin killed around 20 million Ukrainians, starving them to death, but he killed no telling how many millions more. You just look at the evil treatment of the poor Polish people that when he liberated them, he took so many who were what he saw as good slave labor and brought them back in slavery to the Soviet Union, where they either worked as slaves under Stalin or they were killed.

When the Iron Curtain fell, just as many historians, including a brilliant historian I eagerly learned under at Texas A&M—she was not allowed back in the Soviet Union after she wrote about the evil that was done to so many of the Polish officers and people. One of my favorite history teachers, she was terrific, brilliant. But when the Iron Curtain fell, we found out the things that she said and discovered, and others did, were exactly right.

Reagan was right. It was an evil empire. And the one Hitler was trying to build was just about as evil—in some ways, much more evil.

But it is important that young people and millennials understand what we are talking about here. This country, warts and all, has been, as movie-maker Ron Maxwell said, “a history of liberation.” It wasn't founded on slavery. It was on the march toward liberation, each step.

So many Christians, like the Pilgrims and so many others, came to avoid persecution for being Christians. Sometimes, people came who were considered unwanted in other countries.

If you look at the original draft of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, who owned slaves,

had entered what probably was the biggest paragraph setting out a grievance against King George. It is spelled out in this grievance against King George, that he ever allowed slavery to get going in the Colonies, because it was so terrible. It was evil, and it took too long and cost too many lives to get rid of it.

By the way, that grievance didn't end up in the final draft because there were States that objected, that supported slavery. So that grievance Jefferson had originally put in was taken out. It was not in the final draft.

□ 1900

But it took a war that took half a million lives in a country that didn't have half a million lives to spare, devastated the United States.

Lincoln believed the Union should be held together, and it would be held together, and this would be the capital of the whole country.

And he wanted no malice to anyone at the end of the war. He wanted to bring the country together. But it took an ordained Christian minister named Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and so many others, including some who served in Congress, it took them standing for equality and what is right to ensure that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution would mean what it said.

In some ways, in recent years, we have been distracted by people who have been at war, on offense against Christianity, so that now we are to the point where, if you believe what Jesus said, as set out in the New Testament, then you, among so many millions now in our country, are to be an object of scorn and hate.

So, as you see these groups that are really Marxist groups—antifascist does not mean it is a good group; it means it is Marxist. And that is where they want to take us, and it means Christianity will be persecuted to the extent we have seen, with the horrors we have seen over the centuries since Jesus was here.

So there is an article by Igor Norinsky, June 28, in American Greatness, talking about Black Lives Matter.

I really don't believe at all that there is a single member of Congress who doesn't agree Black lives matter. I don't know anybody who is in Congress who does not believe that Black lives matter.

This article starts out saying: “To the 60 percent of Americans not polling for Trump, many firmly left-of-center, a thought experiment as November draws nearer: What must be true so that Trump gets your vote? It is a miserable question because many Americans are, to put it mildly, negative on the President.”

The article goes on—don't have time to go through the whole thing. But the point is made here: “The emotional call-and-response appeal of ‘black lives matter’”—and that is with little B, little L, little M—“entices all who repeat